



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/262,743	03/05/1999	MARI NATORI	02887.0136	9908

22852 7590 11/04/2003

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
1300 I STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
----------

KENDALL, CHUCK O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/262,743

Applicant(s)

NATORI ET AL.

Examiner

Chuck O Kendall

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. This Office Action is the response to the communication received on December 20, 2002. Reconsideration of the instant application is requested by Applicant. All such supporting documentation has been placed of record in the file. Claims 1-14 are pending.
  - a. Previously claims 1-14, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over The San Francisco Project in view of Lau US 5,987,247 and further in view of 5,987,423.
  - b. In this action claims 1-14 still remain rejected under the same grounds as stated above and in previous office action.
  - c. In arguing Applicant asserts as stated in page 3, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of response dated 12/20/03, that neither The San Francisco Project, Arnold nor Lau disclose teaching a **user interface which is part of the Framework**. To sum Applicant's arguments Applicant states " It is clear that the **user interface** is not part of the framework in Arnold et al."
  - d. Examiner has reproduced independent claims as rejected from previous office action for further clarification. Regarding rejection and reasoning in dependent claims refer to previous Office Action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The San Francisco Project in view of Lau USPN 5,987,247 and further in view of Arnold et al USPN 5,987,423 hereinafter Arnold.

Sanfrancisco and Lau discloses constructing a business application system by using a framework described by an object-oriented language,[abstract] the method comprising the steps of: With regards to claims 1,7,11 & 13, the San Francisco project and Lau discloses constructing a business application using a framework. (The San Francisco Project, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, pg 416) comprising an abstract class including core class group, (*Base class / Parent class*, page 420 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph) a report system class group (see figure on pg. 418, for financials also see 2<sup>nd</sup> col. 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph for Business financials/accounts/ledger for equivalence function with reports, a business logic system class group, (see figure on pg. 418, for logistics in model), integrating above mentioned limitations, see 419, last paragraph, and with regards to derived classes as disclosed

above inheriting from base class, is an old and Well known feature in Object Oriented Frameworks), a screen system group, Lau does disclose a screen system in a Business Framework [see fig 2. item #209]. However The Sanfrancisco project as modified doesn't explicitly disclose screen system function for inputting data which can be used by the abstract class group, for calculating, printing and control processing (start / terminating). However Arnold does disclose a User interface (screen system) in a similar configuration which can be used for receiving data for Order processing [5:22-24,10: 47-11: 28, see Order processing, receiving input from control class, also see 15:20-25 for printing, and also see 21:20-30]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated combine the San Francisco project as modified to Arnold to implement the instant claimed invention because, using interfaces (screen system) to receive input and manipulate the input for processing and generating output has been used in the field for years in The Object Oriented Programming and is a general practice.

### Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/20/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive to overcome previous rejection.

(1) As per Applicant's arguments in claim 1, that Arnold neither discloses nor teaches a user interface as part of the Framework, Examiner disagrees. In Column 5, lines 22-24 of Prior art, Arnold shows a user interface which is combined with the core

object classes to generate an application program. Applicant's limitations as recited shows a core class group which includes a screen system (user interface). Examiner understands this to be equivalent. Applicants preamble recites " A method for constructing a business application system by using a framework..." and infact Arnold teaches this by, combining the core object classes with the user interface to generate a self contained Application program.

#### Conclusion

**4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

#### Correspondence Information

**5.** Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck O. Kendall who may be reached via telephone at (703) 308-6608. The

examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam *can be* reached at (703) 305-4552.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

For facsimile (fax) send to central FAX number 703-872-9306 and 703-7467240 draft.

*Chuck D. Kendall*

*Software Engineer Patent Examiner*

*W. H. Z.*  
*WEI ZHEN*  
*primary patent Examiner*